

1 SEDGWICK LLP
2 BRUCE D. CELEBREZZE Bar No. 102181
3 ALEXANDER E. POTENTE Bar No. 208240
4 bruce.celebrezze@sedgwicklaw.com
5 alex.potente@sedgwicklaw.com
6 333 Bush Street
7 30th Floor
8 San Francisco, CA 94104-2834
9 Telephone: (415) 781-7900
10 Facsimile: (415) 781-2635

11 Attorneys for Defendant and Counter- and Cross-Claimant
12 UNION SECURITY INSURANCE COMPANY

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 PAMELA STONEBREAKER, an
16 individual,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 THE GUARDIAN LIFE INSURANCE
20 COMPANY OF AMERICA, a
21 corporation; WESTERN RESERVE LIFE
22 ASSURANCE COMPANY OF OHIO, a
23 corporation, UNION SECURITY
24 INSURANCE COMPANY, a corporation,
25 and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

26 Defendants.

27 And Related Counterclaims and Cross-
28 claims.

CASE NO. 3:11-cv-0797-WQH (WVG)

**UNION SECURITY INSURANCE
COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR RULING
REGARDING DEPOSITION OF
PLAINTIFF PAMELA STONEBREAKER**

[Originally San Diego County Superior Court
Case No. 37-2011-00087721-CU-CO-CTL]

Action Filed: March 16, 2011

Sedgwick^{LLP}

1 On August 31, 2011, the Honorable William Gallo prohibited plaintiff's deposition—
2 which plaintiff had noticed—from proceeding on that day based primarily on the objection of
3 Judge Patricia Cowett, the guardian for the minor Stonebreaker children. The Court indicated
4 that the deposition could proceed on September 13, 2011, for two hours.

5 In plaintiff's supplemental points and authorities in support of her ex parte request to
6 reschedule her motion for partial summary judgment to October 11, 2011 (ECF No. 93), plaintiff
7 represents that this Court "ordered that this would be defendants' opportunity to fully question
8 plaintiff about any issues pertaining to her breach of contract claim." Union Security Insurance
9 Company ("Union Security") believes that this statement does not fully represent Judge Gallo's
10 ruling regarding plaintiff's deposition. Union Security's recollection of the Court's verbal order
11 is set out in the next paragraph.

12 So that there can be no misunderstanding, Union Security respectfully requests that this
13 Court memorialize its ruling in a minute order clarifying 1) that defendants and the guardian ad
14 litem for the minor Stonebreaker children may depose plaintiff at some later date in addition to
15 the deposition proceeding on September 13, 2011, and 2) that the scope of that subsequent
16 deposition would not be limited. Union Security further requests that 3) if Union Security and
17 the other defendants require more than two hours to depose plaintiff on issues relating to
18 defending against her summary judgment motion, the two-hour time limit be treated flexibly by
19 plaintiff, that defendants be liberally allowed additional time to question plaintiff as required to
20 mount a full defense to her motion for summary judgment, and/or that defendants be permitted to
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 file a Rule 56(d) motion in connection with their opposition to the motion for summary
2 judgment.

3 DATED: September 7, 2011 Respectfully submitted,

4 SEDGWICK LLP

5
6 By: /s/ Alexander E. Potente

7 Bruce D. Celebrezze

8 Alexander E. Potente

9 Attorneys for Defendant and Counter- and Cross-

10 Claimant UNION SECURITY INSURANCE

11 COMPANY
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28